DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 598 PS 019 353

TITLE	Hearing on the Reauthorization of the Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act of 1985 and State Dependent Care Development Grants Act. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred First Congress, Second Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	20 Feb 90
NOTE	58p.; Serial No. 101-97. Contains some small/faint type.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (Stock No. 552-070-08630-7, $2.00).
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Caregivers; Early Childhood Education; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Grants; Hearings; Postsecondary Education; Public Schools; *Scholarship Funds; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	CDA; *Child Development Associate; Congress 101st; *Dependent Care Services; Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

A hearing was held to discuss the reauthorization of the Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance (CDASA) Act of 1985 and the State Dependent Care Development Grants (SDCDG) Act. The CDASA Act was created to provide financial assistance to low-income individuals who would otherwise be unable to afford the cost of the CDA application and assessment. The SDCDG Act authorizes funds to states for the planning, establishment, expansion, or improvement of resource and referral programs and before- and after-school child care services for school-age children. Testimony concerned: (1) areas in which improvements would help the CDA legislation achieve its full potential; (2) removal of limitations from the SDCDG Act; (3) the effectiveness of the SDCDG Act and the need for a comprehensive bill that would help subsidize children in child care; and (4) the experience of the public school system in Washington County, Maryland in implementing and using the SDCDG Act. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331598

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1985 AND STATE DEPENDENT CARE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS ACT

PS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, FEBRUARY 20, 1990

Serial No. 101-97

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

PS 20133

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
27-283 WASHINGTON : 1990

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

27-283 O - 90 - 1

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
GLENN POSHARD, Illinois
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
JAIME B. FUSTER, Puerto Rico
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
JIM JONTZ, Indiana
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
PETER SMITH, Vermont
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan, *Chairman*

THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
GLENN POSHARD, Illinois
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
(Ex Officio)

THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
FRED GRANDY, Iowa

(II)

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in Washington, DC, February 20, 1990 1

Statement of:

Phillips, Carol Brunson, Executive Director, Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition; Jill Burkhart, Early Childhood Coordinator, Washington County Board of Education; Sandra Lamm, Executive Director, New York State Child Care Coordinating Council; and Dale B. Fink, Senior Project Associate, School-Age Child Care Project, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women 3

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:

Burkhart, Jill, Early Childhood Coordinator, Washington County Board of Education, prepared statement of 40

Fink, Dale B., Senior Project Associate, School-Age Child Care Project, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, prepared statement of 31

Lamm, Sandra, Executive Director, New York State Child Care Coordinating Council, prepared statement of 22

Phillips, Carol Brunson, Executive Director, Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, prepared statement of 7

HEARING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1985 AND STATE DEPENDENT CARE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS ACT

FEBRUARY, 20, 1990

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:03 p.m., in Room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dale E. Kildee [Chairman] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Kildee, Poshard, and Tauke.

Staff present: Susan Wilhelm, staff director; Damian Thorman, legislative associate; Lisa Morin, professional staff member; and Margaret Kajeckas, clerk/legislative assistant.

Mr. KILDEE. The subcommittee will come to order. We are beginning to have some afternoon hearings because our schedule is getting rather pressed. I know Mr. Tauke is very, very busy. I expect him to be here momentarily. I'm trying to speak over a cold so please bear with me.

The Subcommittee on Human Resources convenes this afternoon to hear testimony on the reauthorization of the Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act and the State Dependent Care Development Grants Act.

The Child Development Associate Scholarship Act was created in 1986 to provide needed financial assistance to low-income individuals who otherwise would be unable to afford the cost of the CDA application and assessment.

The CDA is a performance based professional credential awarded to people with demonstrated ability to work with young children. The credential serves not only as a recognition of an individual's skill in working with children but often is the first step toward further educational achievement. We've seen that throughout the country.

The State Dependent Care Development Grants Act authorizes funds to states for the planning, establishment, expansion or improvement of resource and referral programs as well as before and after child care services for school-age children.

The program's existence is in large part due to the efforts of a former member of the Education and Labor Committee and a great

advocate for children, Sala Burton, who represented San Francisco here in the Congress of the United States.

As a matter of fact, I can recall maybe five or six years ago--I think, Susan, you were present when Sala and Orin Hatch got into a little discussion during a conference committee between the House and Senate. They became kind of the odd couple even back in those days on recognizing that there was some role for the Federal Government in child care.

They became very good friends and cooperated closely together, one, of course, from the liberal wonderful city of San Francisco who indeed was liberal herself, and the other more conservative Senator from Utah. But they recognized that there was a need for some Federal concern for the children of this country.

I watched that friendship grow, their cooperation grow, and was happy to see that Mr. Hatch was cosponsor of the Senate version of the Child Care legislation, making that bill truly bipartisan.

The program which Sala Burton advocated enjoyed bipartisan support at the time of its enactment and continues to play an important role in expanding the availability of resources and referral services and for school-age child care programs.

We welcome all our witnesses and look forward to their testimony concerning the effectiveness of these programs and how they may be improved.

Before proceeding, I'd like to recognize Mr. Tauke who has already demonstrated, over the years I've worked with him, a deep interest in the needs of children in this country. Mr. Tauke.

Mr. TAUKE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We didn't draw too big a crowd this afternoon.

[Laughter.]

Mr. TAUKE. On behalf of my colleagues, I wish to welcome our witnesses who are testifying today on behalf of the Child Development Associate Scholarship and the State Dependent Care Grants Act programs.

State Dependent Care Grants have provided seed money to states that has allowed them to develop, publicize, and attract support from other state sources for programs to assist eligible recipients in need of dependent care services. Particularly in the area of before and after school child care, these funds have helped to deal with the problem of latchkey children.

The flexibility of this grant program is key in that public, private and non-profit entities are eligible to receive funds. This aspect of the program most certainly results in a greater number and diversity of services.

The Child Development Associate Scholarship program is a tool which has helped many individuals attain the credentials to be self-sufficient professional employees in the child care field.

The strength of the CDA program is that it is competency-based. Early childhood professionals realized when they developed the competency standards that a particular type of education or training does not necessarily mean that individuals can deal effectively with children and their families.

Because candidates are evaluated on their performance and may have either formal or informal training, there is a much greater likelihood that qualified individuals who may not have the same

access to formal education may still be able to receive this distinction. That is critically important, of course, in certain areas of the country and among certain groups.

This is particularly helpful, for example, for individuals in rural areas, like many in the State of Iowa, where formal secondary education may be out of reach for a variety of reasons.

I look forward to hearing the testimony of our witnesses, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you for taking the time to have this hearing and thank the witnesses for taking the time to present their views.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Tauke. Mr. Poshard.

Mr. POSHARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say in regard to the Dependent Care Development Grants Act and the effect that it's had upon the child care institutions in my area, I can see that we've come a long way from the babysitting services that were provided several years ago to the point where an educational component is now an integral part of most of our child care opportunities for children. I'm very grateful for that and very supportive of our reauthorizing that act.

In terms of the credentialing process of staff for the child care Head Start folks and others brought about by the Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act, I think that's a great opportunity for many of our people. I think it's very much needed in the field and would very much be supportive of continuing those acts.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Poshard.

Our witnesses this afternoon are Dr. Carol Brunson Phillips, Executive Director of the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, Washington, DC; Ms. Sandra Lamm, Executive Director of the New York State Child Care Coordinating Council, Albany, New York; and Mr. Dale B. Fink, Senior Project Associate, School-Age Child Care Project, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, Massachusetts; and Ms. Jill Burkhart, Early Childhood Coordinator, Washington County Board of Education, Hagerstown, Maryland.

Okay. Would they come forward please.

Dr. Phillips.

STATEMENTS OF CAROL BRUNSON PHILLIPS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COUNCIL FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION; JILL BURKHART, EARLY CHILDHOOD COORDINATOR, WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION; SANDRA LAMM, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NEW YORK STATE CHILD CARE COORDINATING COUNCIL; AND DALE B. FINK, SENIOR PROJECT ASSOCIATE, SCHOOL-AGE CHILD CARE PROJECT, WELLESLEY COLLEGE CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON WOMEN

Dr. PHILLIPS. Good afternoon. I'm Carol Brunson Phillips from the Council. The Council administers the Child Development Associate National Credentialing program.

This program, since its inception in 1975, has provided the Nationally-recognized system that has stimulated early childhood training opportunities and documented the competencies of those working with young children.

A brief overview of the CDA program is contained in my written testimony; thus, my comments this afternoon will focus on the CDA Scholarship Act.

This Act is extremely important legislation that encourages individuals to seek training and certification in the field of early childhood. There are, however, given our experience with the program, several areas which, if improved, would help the legislation achieve its full potential. I will highlight these following my general remarks about the CDA program.

You've heard repeatedly that years of research and professional experience have clearly established the fact that specialized training in child development is the single most important variable in determining the quality of child care programs. Yet, evident in 1975 when the CDA program was established, and still evident today, is that the supply of trained personnel in the field is not keeping pace with the demand.

Among the factors contributing to this condition are the growing numbers of parents of young children in the workforce which spurs a growing need for early childhood services by parents regardless of income, along with the growing recognition of the importance of high quality comprehensive services like Head Start for children living in poverty and other circumstances that place them at risk for later school failure.

These factors have helped to skyrocket the demand for early childhood services. Yet the ability of programs to recruit and retain qualified staff has not kept pace due to a number of characteristics, both of the traditional system for early childhood teacher preparation where costs are high and availability is limited and characteristics of the workplace where compensation and benefits are poor.

The CDA program was created to produce a new category of early childhood professionals designed to increase the number of qualified individuals available to work with young children. The CDA program uses a competency-based approach, which is noteworthy for two reasons. One, it increased training opportunities for those for whom traditional approaches to higher education are inaccessible and, two, it focuses on the specialized skills needed to work with young children and their families.

Since 1975, over 33,000 individuals have received the CDA credential, with the vast majority, over 90 percent, prepared to work in centers with three and four year old children.

In support of the CDA program, the Scholarship Act was authorized by Congress in November of 1986 with a $1 million appropriation for the first year, fiscal year 1987. The funds provide states with scholarships for income eligible individuals to cover the cost of the credentialing program.

Since the scholarship program was instituted, two subsequent appropriations were allocated, creating roughly 11,800 scholarships over the last three years. Scholarships are distributed to states each year based on a population formula, with small states, like Vermont, receiving about ten scholarships and larger states, like Texas, receiving about 300.

The overall impact of this program is currently being documented statistically through state-by-state report data analysis. Howev-

er, anecdotal reports from scholarship recipients cite the successes of the program and identify benefits well beyond the concrete monetary assistance.

Scholarship recipients report feelings of great accomplishment by receiving scholarships, of profound personal reward for their efforts to improve their job skills, and of career incentives to further their formal education. The program further has brought direct access to CDA into the child care workforce at large, making support for the CDA credential available for the first time to the family day care community and to child care programs who heretofore have been without sources of support for staff development.

Yet, despite its successes, reports also reveal several limitations which have constrained the Scholarship Program from achieving its overall intent. Many states have awarded fewer than half their available scholarships, reporting that the income eligibility guidelines are too low. Further, many eligible recipients have been unable to use their scholarships for lack of funds to pay advisors who assist with the CDA process and lack of access to appropriate training.

Several changes in the CDA Scholarship Authorization could eliminate these barriers and make it more usable.

First, raising the income eligibility guidelines. The current guidelines limit an applicant's income to 150 percent of poverty. But because scholarships are awarded only to cover credentialing costs, training costs must be covered by other means. Often those very individuals who are income eligible for credential awards are too poor to purchase training and thus have no means to acquire the skills that are required for credentialing.

Raising the income eligibility guidelines to 75 percent of the state median income would continue to target funds to lower income individuals while greatly expanding the pool of individuals who could benefit from scholarships.

Second, allowing scholarship funds to be used for training. Most individuals who want to become CDAs need training to acquire the skills to become credentialed, especially those lower income individuals who have the fewest resources to cover the cost of training.

Scholarship Award guidelines should be more flexible so that these funds can be used for both training and credentialing purposes.

Third, increasing the maximum scholarship amount available to an individual. The current fee for credentialing is $325, while the cost of training varies widely across the country. By allowing states to increase each scholarship award, income eligible individuals' chances of becoming credentialed would be greatly increased. It is recommended that the maximum individual scholarship amount be raised to $1,500.

Fourth and finally, increasing the total funding of the Scholarship Act. Early childhood programs are currently facing tremendous difficulties recruiting and retaining qualified staff, experiencing nationally a 41 percent annual turnover rate.

Since most newly-hired staff have less training and experience than those who leave, employers are often left with staff who need training to do the jobs to which they have been hired. Beyond the Head Start system employers' budgets simply don't cover these

costs. As a result, the supply of trained personnel is dwindling to the point where more and more centers are requesting waivers of state licensing regulations regarding staff qualifications in order to keep their doors open.

A five-fold increase in total dollar appropriation would be a meaningful step in alleviating this condition and would meet the training needs for the same number of scholarship recipients for whom the Act was originally enacted.

Continued funding for the CDA Scholarship Act will have an impact far in excess of the dollar allocation, for it will help to achieve two timely and important accomplishments—expanding training opportunities for child care programs beyond Head Start, and providing meaningful rewards for obtaining training.

In today's child care community a tremendous need still remains to build incentives for workers to obtain training and certification that will lead to stable careers in early childhood education. The Scholarship Act has been an important source of financial and professional support to these individuals, and it has helped to improve the capability of states to ensure a trained and skilled workforce to their growing child care delivery systems.

[The prepared statement of Carol Brunson Phillips follows:]

Testimony of Carol Brunson Phillips

before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the

Education and Labor Committee

U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

February 20, 1990

My name is Carol Brunson Phillips and I am the Executive Director of the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, a private organization based in Washington, D.C. The Council administers the Child Development Associate (CDA) National Credentialing Program. Since its inception in 1975, the CDA program has provided a nationally recognized system that has stimulated early childhood training opportunities and documented the competencies of those working with young children.

This afternoon I will provide a brief overview of the CDA program and how it works and also discuss the CDA Scholarship Act. The Scholarship Act is extremely important legislation that encourages individuals to seek training and certification in the early childhood field. There are, however, several areas of improvement needed in order for the legislation to achieve its full potential. I will highlight these following my general remarks about the CDA training and credentialing process.

The Need for Early Childhood Training

Years of research and professional experience have clearly established that specialized training in child development and early childhood education is the single most important variable in determining the quality of program experiences provided to young children. Yet, evident in 1975 when the CDA program was established and still evident today, is that the supply of trained personnel in the field is not keeping pace with the demand. Among the conditions contributing to this problem are a growing need for early childhood services by families regardless of income,

and the recognition of the importance of providing high quality, comprehensive services like Head Start for children living in poverty or other circumstances that place them at risk for later school failure.

The growth in labor force participation by mothers of young children has soared dramatically over the last two decades, helping to spur the increased demand for early childhood programs. In 1970, just 29% of all children under age 6 had mothers in the labor force. By 1975, that figure had reached 36%. By 1988, over half (51%) of all preschool children had mothers in the labor force. But the demand for early childhood programs is not solely the result of mothers in the labor force. Attendance in early childhood programs has increased among children of employed as well as non-employed mothers, especially for 3- and 4-year-olds. This is due, no doubt, to the growing public understanding of the benefits of good early childhood programs for children's later development.

The benefits of good early childhood programs are especially pronounced for children of low-income families. The need for such programs has grown as the percentage of young children living in poverty has increased over the last two decades. In 1970, 17% of all preschool children were living in poverty. By 1987, that figure had surpassed 22%. Black and Hispanic children are two to three times more likely than white children to be living in poverty. As the success of Head Start has so convincingly shown, it is particularly important that children living in

poverty, who are by definition at risk for later school failure, are provided with a high quality, comprehensive early childhood program.

While the demand for early childhood services has skyrocketed, the ability of programs to recruit and retain qualified staff has not kept pace. Due to a number of characteristics (both of the traditional system for early childhood teacher preparation -- where costs are high and availability limited -- and of the workplace -- where compensation and benefits are poor), the CDA program was created to produce a new category of early childhood professional. Designed to increase the number of qualified individuals available to work with young children and their families, the program has not yet achieved its goal; although its potential to do so still exists. Using a competency-based approach to training and credentialing, it remains noteworthy for two reasons: 1) it increases training opportunities for those for whom traditional approaches to higher education are, by perception or reality, inaccessible, and 2) it focuses on the specialized skills needed to work with young children and their families.

Overview of the CDA Program

The CDA program offers credentials to caregivers in four types of settings: (1) center-based programs for preschoolers, (2) center-based programs for infant/toddlers, (3) family day care homes, and (4) home visitor programs. Regardless of setting, all CDAs must demonstrate their ability to provide competent

care and early education practice in 13 skill areas. Evidence of ability is collected by four individuals who have first-hand observational knowledge of the CDA candidate's performance with children and families. This team, which includes the candidate himself or herself, reviews all the evidence and then votes to decide whether the CDA Credential should be issued.

The CDA national office sets the standards for competent performance and monitors this assessment process so that it is uniform throughout the country. Since 1975, over 33,000 individuals have received the CDA Credential, with the vast majority (over 90%) prepared to work in centers with 3- and 4-year-old children.

The CDA Scholarship Program

The CDA Scholarship Program was authorized by the Congress in November 1986, with a $1 million appropriation for Fiscal Year 1987. The funds provide states with scholarships for income eligible individuals to cover the costs of the credentialing process. Since the scholarship program was instituted, two subsequent appropriations were allocated -- $1,436,000 for Fiscal Year 1988 and $1,468,000 for Fiscal Year 1989 -- creating roughly 11,800 scholarships over the last 3 years. Scholarships are distributed to states each year based on a population formula with small states like Vermont receiving approximately 10 and larger states like Texas receiving approximately 300.

The overall impact of this program is currently being documented through state-by-state program report data analyses. However, anecdotal reports from scholarship recipients cite benefits well beyond the concrete monetary assistance. Success stories told by individuals point to experiencing feelings of "great accomplishment" by receiving a scholarship, of "profound personal reward" for their efforts to improve their job skills, and of "career incentive" to further their formal education. Further, the program has brought direct access to CDA into the childcare workforce at-large, making support for CDA credentialing available for the first time to the family day care community, and to child care programs who heretofore have been without sources of support for staff developmental.

Yet, despite its successes, reports also reveal several limitations which have constrained the scholarship program from achieving its overall intent. Many states have awarded fewer than half their available scholarships, reporting that the income eligibility guidelines are too low. Further, many eligible recipients have been unable to use their scholarships for lack of funds to pay Advisors and little or no access to appropriate training.

Recommendations for Improving the CDA Scholarship Program

Several changes in the CDA Scholarship Program could eliminate these barriers and make it more useable to those individuals seeking careers in early childhood.

- **Raising the Income Eligibility Guidelines**

The current income eligibility guidelines limit applicant's income to 150% of poverty. Because scholarships are awarded only to cover credentialing costs, training costs must be covered by other means. Often those individuals who are income eligible under the current guidelines are too poor to purchase training, and thus have no means to acquire the skills required for credentialing. A number of states have reported that they have been unable to spend their allotments because of individuals who want and need scholarships have no way to use them unless they can also get help with accessing training. *Raising the income eligibility guidelines to 75% of the state median income would continue to target funds to lower income individuals, while greatly expanding the total pool of individuals who could benefit from scholarships.*

- **Allowing Scholarship Funds to be Used for Training and Credentialing**

Most individuals who want to become CDAs need training to acquire the skills to become credentialed, especially those lower income individuals who have the fewest resources to cover the costs of training. *Scholarship award guidelines should be more flexible so that they can be used for both training and credentialing purposes.* This is especially important given the imminent changes in the CDA program where beginning this fall, individuals who attend a CDA

27-283 0 - 90 - 2

Professional Preparation Program will be awarded a CDA Credential upon their successful completion. The cost for credentialing will be subsumed under the cost for training. Further, others who choose to obtain training through other programs and seek a CDA Credential through the traditional process would also benefit if financial assistance were available for training purposes as well.

- **Increasing the Maximum Scholarship Amount Available to an Individual**

The current fee for credentialing is $325, while the cost of training varies widely across the country. (Based on a 1988 national survey conducted by the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, 1 year of study leading to a certificate in early childhood education varies from $100 to $3,000, with an average cost of $1,420.) By allowing states to increase each scholarship award to at least $1,500, income eligible individuals' chances for becoming credentialed will be greatly increased. *Given the need to include training costs, as well as credentialing costs, it is recommended that the maximum individual scholarship amount be raised to $1,500.*

- **Increasing the Total Funding of the Scholarship Act**

Early childhood programs are currently facing tremendous difficulties recruiting and retaining qualified staff. Nationally programs are experiencing a 41% annual turnover rate. Most newly hired staff do not have the training and experience

of those who leave, and thus once employed, need to obtain the specialized training required to provide decent care and education to our nation's young children. Beyond Head Start Programs, employers' budgets simply don't cover these costs. And as a result, the supply of trained personnel is dwindling to the point where more and more centers are requesting waivers of state licensing regulations regarding staff qualifications in order to keep their doors open -- one of the conditions that the initial enactment of the Scholarship Act was intended to alleviate. *A five-fold increase in total dollar appropriation would be a meaningful step in accomplishing this goal, by meeting the training needs for the same number of scholarship recipients for whom the Act was originally enacted.*

Continued support and increased funding for the CDA Scholarship Act will serve to support early childhood educators in two additional ways which have become even more critical since the Act was first passed in 1986.

- **Expanding Training Opportunities for Personnel Beyond Head Start**

Currently, 80% of CDAs obtained their credentials while employed in Head Start programs. Head Start's commitment to staff training and their new requirement that early childhood certified personnel be employed in every classroom by 1992 have had a tremendous impact in upgrading the quality of staff and consequently the quality of Head Start services. However, many more of our nation's children are served in family day care homes and other child care centers

than are served by Head Start. Strategies need to be developed that would encourage these programs to give this same emphasis toward increased training and credentialing. *A significant increase in scholarship amounts and allowing the funds to be used for training are important steps in this direction.*

- **Providing Meaningful Rewards for Obtaining Training**

A recent survey revealed that the number of CDAs who received a salary increase or better position as a result of obtaining a CDA Credential had increased by 12% in the past 5 years. Though the wages in early childhood overall continue to be depressed when compared with other occupations requiring similar training, there is evidence that the CDA program is gaining increased recognition, an important trend for stemming the high rate of turnover in the field. However, yet to be resolved is the problem of providing consistent career ladders in the field. There is little articulation between the various levels of formal preparation, therefore, an individual obtaining a CDA can seldom apply that experience toward obtaining an A.A. degree. The situation is similar for those obtaining an A.A. degree, who are often not able to apply these experiences toward a B.A. degree. New this year are two efforts by the profession to promote this articulation -- the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) is adopting a position statement on a Model for Professional Development and the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition is launching its CDA Professional Preparation

CDA Candidates: You may be eligible for federal financial aid for your CDA assessment and credentialing fee. Contact your state agency for more information.

CDA SCHOLARSHIP ACT ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES, As of January 1990

Alabama
June Perry, Supervisor
Office of Day Care & Child Dev.
64 North Union Street
Montgomery, AL 36130-1801
205-261-5785

Alaska
Mia Oxley, Exec. Director
Child Care Connection
P.O. Box 103344
Anchorage, AK 99510-3344
907-278-2273

Arizona
Ellen D. Montenari, Director
Central Arizona College
Signal Peak Campus
Coolidge, AZ 85228
602-723-4141

Arkansas
Debbie Ferguson, Program Coordinator
Div. of Children & Family Services
P.O. Box 1437
Little Rock, AR 72203
501-682-8548

California
Ann H. Ransford
Glendale Community College
1500 North Verdugo Road
Glendale, CA 91208
818-240-1000 x 440

Colorado
Janet Horner
Red Rocks Community College
Campus Box 22
12600 West Sixth Avenue
Golden, CO 80401
303-988-6160 x 278

Connecticut
Mavis La Bossiere
Dept. of Human Resources
1049 Asylum Avenue
Hartford, CT 06105
203-566-4688

Delaware
Phyllis Wilson
Licensing Services
21 The Green - 2nd
Dover, DE 19901
302-736-5487

District of Columbia
Barbara Kamara
609 H Street, N.E., Suite 412
Washington, D.C. 20002
202-727-1839
202-727-5951

Florida
Judy Meyer, (Interim)
Florida Dept of Ed
Room 210 Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
904-488-1659

Georgia
Dr. Martha Abbott-Shim
Early Childhood Ed., GA State Univ.
University Plaza
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-651-2584

Guam
Lucy M. Cashwend, Program Director
Head Start, Dept. of Education
P.O. Box DE
Agana, GU 96913
671-472-8901X470/474

Hawaii
Walter Choy
Office of Community Services
335 Merchant Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
808-548-2014

Idaho
Susan Ohman, Director
Human Service Center
P.O. Box 1310
Idaho Falls, ID 83403-1310
208-525-7159

Illinois
Georgia Churchill
Dept. Children & Family Services
406 East Monroe Street
Springfield, IL 62701-1498
217-785-9208

Indiana
Marcia Regenstrief
Indiana Dept. of Human Services
251 N. Illinois Street, P.O. Box 7083
Indianapolis, IN 46207-7083
317-232-7125

Iowa
Gary Lawson
Children, Youth Families
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
515-281-8077

Kansas
Irene Davis
Dept. Social & Rehab. Adult Services
2700 West 6th Street
Topeka, KS 66606
913-296-2702

Kentucky
Lydia Roberts
Cabinet for Human Resources
275 Main Street
Frankfort, KY 40621
502-564-2136

Louisiana
Barbara Pickney
Head Start Director
P.O. Drawer 1510
Opelousas, LA 70570-1510
318-948-3651

Maine
Jude Maston
Div. Of Community Services
Station House 73
Augusta, ME 04333
207-289-3771

Maryland
Bertha Holbrook, Spec. Asst.
State Scholarship Admin.
2100 Guilford Avenue, Room 207
Baltimore, MD 21218
301-333-6420

Massachusetts
Merle M. Leak, Coordinator
EOHS Office of Children
10 West Street
Boston, MA 02111
617-727-8909

Michigan
Sue Allen, Dir. Special Proj.
Office of Children & Youth Services
300 South Capitol Avenue
Lansing, MI 48909
517-373-0356

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program. *Scholarship assistance for early childhood personnel at this critical time will help support the entrance of entry level personnel onto a stable career track, thus promoting increased professionalism in the workforce.*

Summary

In today's child care community, a tremendous need remains to build incentives for workers to obtain training and certification which will lead to stable careers in early childhood education. The Scholarship Act has been an important source of financial and professional support to individuals. But beyond that, it has also helped to improve the capability of states to insure a trained and skilled workforce to their growing child care delivery systems.

Reauthorization of the CDA Scholarship Act is vital and should include:

- raising the income eligibility guidelines
- allowing its use for training as well as credentialing
- increasing the maximum amounts available to individuals
- increasing the total appropriation

Minnesota
Dr. Daniel Gartrell, CD Trng. Prog.
130 Education - Art Building
Bemidji State University
Bemidji, MN 56601
218-755-2073

Mississippi
Kaye Keeton
P.O. Box 86
Stringer, MS 39481
601-477-8311

Missouri
Jerry Simon, Assistant Deputy Dir.
Div. of Family Services
P.O. Box 88
Jeffers-n City, MO 65101
314-751-8954

Montana
Colleen McGuire, CDA Coordinator
CDA Training Box 31
Western Montana College
Dillon, MT 59725
406-683-7176

Nebraska
Fayette Carpenter, Admin.
Community Action of Nebraska, Inc.
521 South 14th Street, Suite 308
Lincoln, NE 68508
402-435-8016

Nevada
Patricia Hedgecoth, Chief
Bureau of Services for Childcare
505 East King Street, Room 606
Carson City, NV 89710
702-885-5911

New Hampshire
Robert Letellier, Chief
Bureau of Child Care Standards
Dept. of Health and Human Services
Concord, NH 03301
603-271-4523

New Jersey
Mary E. Singletary, Director
Div. of Women
NJ Dept. of Comm. Affairs, CN 801
Trenton, NJ 08625-0801
609-292-8840

New Mexico
Jeannette Trancosa, Coordinator
CDI/NM CDA Program
3812 Central Avenue, SE
Albuquerque, NM 87108
505-265-8287

Wisconsin
Mary Babula, Executive Director
WI Early Childhood Asso.
1245 East Washington Ave.
Madison, WI 53703
608-257-0909

New York
Lola Cole, Chief Welfare Specialist
NYS Dept. of Social Services
40 North Pearl, Floor 11-B
Albany, NY 12243
518-474-9618

North Carolina
Barbara Spaulding
Child Day Care, Dept. Human Resources
701 Barbour Drive
Raleigh, NC 27603
919-733-4801

North Dakota
Dr. Ann Mullis
Child Dev. & Family Services
North Dakota State Univ.(P.O. Box 5057
Fargo, ND 58105
701-237-8268

Ohio
Susan L. Freitman
ODMS/Div. of Adult & Child Services
30 East Broad Street, 30th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
614-466-1043

Oklahoma
Ruth Ann Ball, OACUS
Rose State Child Dev. Center
6420 SE 15th
Midwest City, OK 73110
405-733-7411

Oregon
Steffen Saifer
Head Start Training Office
Portland State University
Portland, OR 97207
503-464-4815

Pennsylvania
Jessica Van Ord
Keystone Univ Research Corp.
652 West 17th Street
Erie, PA 16502
800-662-2422

Puerto Rico
Edwin Colon Pagan
Office for Human Dev.
King's Court and Loiza Street
Santurce, PR 00914
809-728-0237

Rhode Island
Francine Connolly, Chief
Office of Child Care
600 New London Avenue
Cranston, RI 02920
401-464-3415

Wyoming
Kathy Emmons
Dept. of Health & Social Services
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002-0710
307-777-7115

South Carolina
Kitty G. Casoli
Health & Human Serv. Finance Comm.
P.O. Box 8206
Columbia, SC 29202-8206
803-253-6154

South Dakota
Nancy Gowen, President
South Dakota AEYC
1609 Palo Verde
Rapid City, SD 57701
605-342-5066

Tennessee
Barbara A. Nye, Executive Director
TN State Univ.- CDA Program
330 10th Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37203-3401
615-251-1540

Texas
Deborah Latimer
Corporate Child Dev. Fund
8029 Capital of TX Hwy. N., Suite 102
Austin, TX 78704-7920
512-440-8555

Utah
Mary L. Olsen
Dept. of Social Services
120 North 200 West-P.O. Box 45500
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
801-538-4100

Vermont
Lee Lauber
Early Childhood Programs
Vermont College of Norwich Univ.
Montpelier, VT 05602
802-223-8767

Virginia
Catherine A. Loveland, Coordinator
Provider Training, Licensing Program
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, VA 23229-8699
804-662-9025

Washington
Dr. Roberta Wong Bouverat
President, WAEYC
1017 Chuckanut Drive
Bellingham, WA 98226
206-676-3979

West Virginia
Kay Tilton, Director
WV Dept. of Human Resources
1900 Washington Street, East
Charleston, WV 25305
304-348-7980

US Virgin Islands
Ms. Zenaida Conde
Dept of Human Services
20 A Strand & 5 BB Smith SR
Christiansted, St. Croix, V.I.
809-773-2323

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Dr. Phillips.

Ms. Lamm.

Ms. LAMM. Thanks for inviting me to be here today. I'd like to just introduce the New York State Child Care Coordinating Council briefly. We are a private, non-profit membership organization which provides a variety of training and technical assistance programs for child care in New York state.

One of the programs that we administer on behalf of the state Department of Social Services is the CDA scholarship program for the state. We are also involved in a data collection project which is funded with the Dependent Care Planning Grants to New York state. So, I'd like to speak briefly to both of those programs if I could.

As Dr. Phillips indicated, the CDA program is a much-needed and very valuable credentialing program. Since the program's inception in 198,7 in New York state we've been able to award 30 of the about 600 scholarships that have been available. There's really two major problems which again Dr. Phillips highlighted.

One of those is that the income guidelines are too low. At 150 percent of the poverty level, the eligibility is really the main reason that the program has been underutilized. New York state is not alone in finding this to be true. In talking to other states to prepare this testimony, I learned that Florida, South Dakota and other states are facing the same problem and requesting that the income levels be raised.

The eligibility is based on family income, and this is one of the problems because even though child care workers are on very low salaries, they can't support a family on those salaries, so they live in families. Even though the family income may not be very high, it's too high to meet the income criteria.

In New York state our median income is over $28,000 and yet at a 150 percent of the Federal poverty level, a family of six would still not be eligible because 150 percent of poverty level for a family of six is $24,270. So, that's the first major problem.

The second major obstacle is the restriction on the use of funds to the scholarship for assessment only, precluding subsidizing training, paying for advisors, and other resources that are necessary. In New York we found that where there was paid training available through a community college or a child care resource referral agency, or some other community group, and where there was an advisor paid through some other source, that's where most of our CDA applicants are coming from.

Family day care providers, where most of the child care in this country is provided, are really denied access to the CDA unless they have access to some paid training or paid advisor, and that's the other real main problem.

Training funds are available nowhere else in any existing or planned Federal legislation, and that's why the CDA is especially important. The average national wage for child care staff, according to the Child Care Staffing Study, is $5.35 an hour, which comes out to about $11,000 a year as an annual salary. The CDA provides an informal and less expensive professional training program than is otherwise available.

The demand for quality child care is escalating rapidly and we expect that it will continue to do so. So, having trained professionals enter and stay in the field is critically important. I'd make three recommendations relating to these problems.

One is to raise the income eligibility limit to 125 percent of the state median income and allow states to set the income guideline for their state appropriately for the needs of the citizens of that state so that people who need the scholarship have access to it.

Secondly, to allow the states more flexibility in how they spend the funding. If there is a need for advisors in one part of the state, they should be able to spend it that way. If there is a need for training, the state should have the flexibility to do that. Also, to change the amount of the scholarship so that the full cost of training can be paid.

Thirdly, I would recommend that the allocation be increased to allow the states to meet these needs to expand the program and to allow the states a reasonable sum with which to work.

Regarding the Dependent Care Development program, these grants to the states have been extremely helpful in planning the development of child care resource and referral agencies and building their capacity to offer services.

Illinois, Mr. Poshard's state, has done a really good job of using the Dependent Care Planning Grant to develop a clear plan for implementing resource and referral agencies.

As with other needs in child care, the need for CCR&R services is growing and will continue to grow. However, this program needs to be responsive to the changing needs and the continuing needs of CCR&R, child care resource and referral agencies, for funding.

Unlike other services, such as direct child care services, R&R agencies are not able to charge a fee for services that will meet the cost of delivering those services. Stable ongoing funding is necessary to allow them to develop the services that then they can market and to allow them to leverage other public and private funds.

The planning grants have been helpful in figuring out what to do and how to do it, but we can only tell people for so long how to do something before we give them the resources with which to do it. The Dependent Care Development Grants can do that if the restriction on the use of the funds is lifted.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views with you.

[The prepared statement of Sandra Lamm follows:]

NEW YORK STATE
CHILD CARE COORDINATING COUNCIL
237 Bradford Street, Albany, New York 12206 (518) 463-8663

The Dependent Care Development Grants Act

and

The Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act

Testimony of Sandra Lamm
New York State Child Care Coordinating Council

before the

Committee on Education and Labor

Washington, D.C. February 20, 1990

all income levels. Third, the use of allocations to the states should be more flexible, so that training could be provided where needed, advisors or coordinators could be hired, and overhead expenses could be met. Our experience administering the scholarship fund in New York State, and the experience of other administrative agencies nationwide, documents these needs. In New York, allocations have been made to fund almost 600 CDA assessment scholarships. To publicize the availability of scholarships, we sent mailings to all licensed child care facilities in the state, including Head Start, day care centers, and family day care homes; to all CDA advisors and representatives; to all individuals who had inquired of the National Credentialing Program about the CDA credential; and to all educational institutions offering early childhood or child development courses. In addition, we use our statewide network of child care resource and referral agencies, other organizations and individuals, and our bi-monthly newsletter to over 600 locations throughout the state, to publicize the scholarship program. However, despite this recruitment effort, only 30 scholarships have been awarded.

According to our members and potential applicants, the two major obstacles to taking advantage of the scholarship are the low income eligibility guidelines and the lack of available training. One paid CDA coordinator who works in two upstate rural counties wrote: "I am presently working with 6-8 candidates in the Tompkins/Cortland area dn I have been giving them the scholarship applications hoping that this will help some of them. The feedback I get is that no one can survive with a family on an income as low as 150% of the Federal Poverty Guideline. Most of them make jsut above the cut-off in their full time jobs as teachers/caregivers in centers in the area."[2] Another member of our organization compared the CDA scholarship to the eligibility for subsidized child care in their county. "The present federal guidelines are too low to qualify candidates in Rockland County [suburban to New York City]. A candidate's gross family income must be at or below 150% of the federal poverty level. In this area social services day care eligibility had to be raised to 200% of the federal poverty level in order to find eligible families. The Child Development Associate Credential is critical in supplying trained staff to the growing number of child day care centers. We need to liberalize the guidelines so that our workers can take advantage of the fund."[3]

Other states report similar difficulties in providing scholarships to those who need them when the income guidelines are so low. The Keystone Research Group which administers scholarships for Pennsylvania reports as of February, 1990, that less than one quarter of the available scholarships have been awarded. Connecticut has been able to award slightly over 25% of available scholarships. Florida, which has a lower state median income than northeastern states, was awarding scholarships very slowly until the state's Education Department instituted a pre school program for four-year-olds and made the CDA credential a minimum requirement for employment. (The cost of training is also subsidized by the state of Florida). At national meetings of CDA scholarship program agencies, the call for raising eligibility levels is always heard. In informal discussions, it seems that the states that do best in actually awarding the scholarships are those that have stretched the rules.

To make the eligibility level responsive to variations across states and regions, the income guideline should be based on state median income instead of the federal poverty level. Each state should have the flexibility to set the income guideline at up to 115 or 125% of the state median income. At the very least, the limit should be raised to 200% of the federal poverty level, which is a more fair level for many states.

The second major obstacle is the lack of training and support to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I am Sandra Lamm, Executive Director of the New York State Child Care Coordinating Council (NYSCCCC) located in Albany, New York, which is a private, non-profit membership organization devoted to expanding the supply of affordable, quality child care throughout New York State. Our members are child care resource and referral agencies, individuals and other organizations who share in this goal.

NYSCCCC offers a training and technical assistance project to child care resource and referral agencies statewide and the Child Development Associate Scholarship program for the state, both under contract to the state Department of Social Services. In addition, the state's Council on Children and Families sub-contracts with NYSCCCC for a data collection project with part of the state's Dependent Care Development Grant for child care resource and referral agency development. We urge the continuation of both the Dependent Care Development Grants program and the CDA Scholarship program, and will recommend changes, especially in the CDA program.

The Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act

The Child Development Associate program is intended to offer professional development and growth to staff in child care centers and Head Start programs, and to family day care providers through a credentialling program. Currently the demand for an expanded supply of child care is great. It is anticipated that there will be a continuing escalation in the number of programs. High quality child care in which young children will thrive depends in large part on the adults providing this care. Unfortunately, low compensation has led to increasingly high turnover rates in child care programs over the last 13 years, and the quality of care has suffered greatly. According to the National Child Care Staffing Study, conducted by the Child Care Employee Project in 1989 and released last fall, turnover rates have jumped from 15% in 1977 to 41% in 1989.[1] The study also found a strong correlation between salaries and the quality of care provided when measured on the Clifford and Harms rating scale.

With average salaries of $5.35 an hour, child care staff leave the field in alarming numbers. It has become increasingly important that on-going training and educational opportunities are available to the adults who work with young children, since those being recruited to work in child care have less appropriate preparation than ever before. The Child Development Associate credential can offer an opportunity for a child care provider or teacher to improve her or his knowledge and skills in working with young children, as well as a professional credential. Funding for scholarships is available from no other existing or pending federal child care legislation.

Since the assessment and credentialling process is less formal and less expensive than getting a two- or four-year degree, the CDA can be more accessible to professionals in the field. The scholarship program, which pays the $325.00 assessment fee for income eligible candidates, can eliminate an obstacle in obtaining the credential, and thereby encourage the entrance of skilled staff into child care programs.

However, there are several problems with the scholarship program which could be reduced in reauthorizing the program so that it would more effectively accomplish the goal of improving the quality of child care in Head Start, child care centers, and family day care homes. First, the income eligibility guidelines, which are extremely restrictive, should be increased and made more responsive to variations across states. Second, funding for training programs and trainers is essential to the success of the program and to ensuring access for candidates at

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

allow the candidate to complete the credentialling process. When the candidate is part of an organization that has staff available to provide these services, such as a Head Start program or some day care centers, the candidate is much more likely to complete the process. For family day care providers, or those who work outside such a supportive program, the process is much more difficult. In New York, the majority of our scholarships have been awarded to four geographic areas. In each, a paid professional is located at a child care resource and referral agency, a community college, or a child care program to help the candidate through the process, identify or develop training resources, and provide other support. The Day Care Directors Association of Onondaga County (New York) wrote "We do have a number of potential candidates eligible for scholarships in the areas of infant/toddler and preschool. However, without funds to pay for an advisor or CDA trainer, we are symied in our efforts to implement this program locally."[4] The need for paid training and advisors is not unique to New York State. According to Edith Mayor, at Eastern Connecticut State University, free training should be available for center staff and family day care providers. Other states also echo this need. The increased need for formal training with the new "Council model" exacerbates the need for funding for training.

The scholarship allowed to each recipient should be increased from $325 to at least $1,500, to allow the candidate to purchase the necessary training and pay the assessment fee.

Third, allowing states more flexibility in how their scholarship allocation is funded would greatly increase the effectiveness of the program. One state's current CDA scholarship allocation is $18,000, resulting in a $1,800 administrative line. Providing publicity, staff time, phone expenses, and general overhead will far exceed this amount. In one state the need may be greatest for new advisors, in another the need may be for resource materials and publicity, in another formal training needs to be subsidized.

Each participating state should have the flexibility to assign allocated scholarship funds where the need is greatest within that state, within a range of allowable activities.

Dependent Care Development Grants Act

The Dependent Care Development Grants have been helpful in developing child care resource and referral (CCR&R) systems. The grants have stimulated the development of CCR&R but could be more responsive to continuing needs.

A number of states, notably those in the mid- and western parts of the country, have used the development grants effectively to develop a statewide plan for child care resource and referral, to offer start-up funding and technical assistance, and to develop state network associations. Alaska, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, and Colorado have made progress in these ways. Several other states, including Michigan and New York, have used the dependent care development grants to develop statewide data collection systems through the resource and referral systems to help CCR&R agencies to provide more effective and efficient services.

However, the limitations on how the grants can be spent have limited their effectiveness. Once the overall planning has been accomplished, operational funding to CCR&R agencies is necessary. For example, in New York State, in a number of locations a group or committe has already developed an organizational plan for a CCR&R service, have a funding proposal prepared but lack the funding to begin building the agency. Historically, we have seen over and over again that relatively small operating grants allow

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CCR&R agencies to leverage other public and private funds. The stable operating base is necessary first. A grant of $30,000 or $40,000 can purchase enough staff time and overhead to market the CCR&R agency to other funders. Without this operating money, the most carefully planned CCR&R system will not get off the ground.

A survey should be conducted of all states to determine how the Dependent Care Development Grants have encouraged the expansion of CCR&R within each state. States should be held accountable for the effective use of their allocations.

CCR&R's are necessary to planning and developing child care services, improving the quality of those services, and helping families gain access to those services. With the growing demand on the child care system, now is the time to take CCR&R services out of the planning stage and into the implementation stage nationwide. The prohibition on using funds for operating costs should be lifted, and effective implementation of the program should be more carefully monitored.

NOTES

1. Child Care Employee Project. Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America. October, 1989.

2. Cochran, Eva, Tompkins Cortland Community College. Letter to NYSCCCC, December 14, 1988.

3. Helbraun, Phyllis, Rockland Council for Young Children. Letter to Senator Alfonse D'Amato, May 18, 1989.

4. Lehman, Leone, Secretary, Day Care Directors Association of Onondaga County. Letter to NYSCCCC, April 17, 1989.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Ms. Lamm.

Mr. Fink.

Mr. FINK. Good afternoon. Mr. Chairman and members, thanks a lot for giving me this chance to testify. It's a particular pleasure, as a citizen, to be able to come to the Congress of the United States and to say that you are our lawmakers and I am here principally in this instance to report to you that you enacted a very good law.

I am here to talk about the Dependent Care Grants Act, specifically that portion of it—as you know, it's divided into two portions—but that portion of it that deals with school-age child care, which is 60 percent of each state's grant. That is what I am here to address today.

I am part of a small research group at Wellesley College in Massachusetts called the School-Age Child Care Project, and we spend all of our time looking at the so-called latchkey child issue and looking at the development of alternatives for school-age children.

I am going to be concise. You have my written testimony and I've also given to the staff to be distributed too a book which was just written by the director of our project and myself that came out at the end of 1989 called "No Time to Waste—an Action Agenda for School-Age Child Care." I hope you'll get a chance to look at that.

In that book, among other things, we developed a series of 15 recommendations that we thought would take this issue into the 1990s, and actually, the second of our 15 recommendations was to reauthorize the Dependent Care Grant Act. We do have one small change we'd like to make on it. I'll talk about that a little bit later.

Mostly I'm here to underline the fact that the Dependent Care Grant Act has been a very successful effective piece of legislation.

I might diverge for just one moment to say that just after I finished faxing a copy of my testimony here a few days ago I was driving home in the car and I heard a new item on the radio in which I heard that a company is about to release something called Kids Cuisine, which is something that kids can cook for themselves at home in the microwave oven.

Now, I would not put down any American entrepreneur who has found a gap in the market and is going to go out there and fill it. But I guess what I want to convey to the House of Representatives is that the Dependent Care Grant Act is a different approach to filling the time of kids who are left alone.

As a matter of fact, the approach is really to not have so many kids left alone and to create constructive programs at schools, at community centers, and other places, so that children can be doing sports, doing art, interacting with peers, interacting with competent adults and having a productive time.

I would now just like to cite for your understanding of why it's important that kids not be home alone two pieces of information that I didn't put into my written testimony, which is that when public school teachers were polled in 1987 about whether or not it was a problem of kids going home alone, 51 percent of them cited children spending time alone as the most significant barrier to effective school performance.

When school principals were asked in 1987 by the National Association of Elementary School Principals about this issue, 84 percent

of them said that kids would be better off if there were more before and after school programs and summer programs for the times that schools were not in session.

So, what has the Dependent Care Grant Act done about this problem? Well, I have in my written testimony illustrated that with some details. I'm just going to give you the highlights here.

But, to give you a for instance, in the State of Vermont where grant is the floor level of $50,000—which means only thirty thousand of it goes to school-age child care—they report to us that three-quarters of all the programs for school-age kids in the State of Vermont that have been started since 1985 have been started with small seed grants from this Dependent Care Act. So that is very significant.

In Tennessee we find that of approximately 100 new licensed school-age child care programs since 1985, 87 of them got off the ground with the help of the Dependent Care Grant Act.

Most times we're talking about very small grants of $2,000 or $3,000, up to maybe $10,000, that are going out to a community group, a YMCA, a parents' group, a school district, and they're using this as the seed money to get started. Then the program becomes self-funding.

In Alabama over that same period of time—and there, the Community Education Division of the State Education Department is handling this funding stream—they've gone from three school districts with extended day programs to 43 and have approximately 15,000 school children now attending those before and after school programs.

I'll just give you a few others. There's more enclosed in my written testimony. Pennsylvania has estimated that they have created 352 new programs with 7,000 slots for school-age children; Utah, 15 new programs; and Michigan, approximately 5,000 more school-age children in licensed care since 1985.

We think that this speaks very strongly of the success of this measure in putting out information, bringing professional development to this field, bringing the kind of small start-up monies that are necessary to help grassroots and local groups get going in this service field.

But there is an issue in many communities that these grants cannot always be used if they don't have the parents there to self-fund the programs once they're off the ground. You give a grant for start-up, expansion or improvement, and you're assuming that somebody is going to be there to pay the daily operating costs, to pay the weekly fees.

In some communities, that is possible. In most of the ones I've just cited, that's the way it's going. But there are places where this kind of grant cannot be accessed because you have a lot of low-income and moderate-income families who just simply aren't going to have the funds and you don't have other alternative sources.

Now, in our book "No Time to Waste" we have recommended that Congress address this. We have recommended that it not address it specifically through modifying this legislation but by passing comprehensive child care legislation of the kind that you've been discussing for the past year or more. A comprehensive bill that would help to subsidize people's children in child care, wheth-

er they're infants, toddlers, preschoolers, or school-agers, is very necessary.

But I do want to make that point, that this bill continuing to be authorized without another vehicle to allow for some subsidy in some operating costs is not going to help all communities.

Now I come to the final point about one change we would like to see in this authorization.

As you know, you wrote in a floor of $50,000 for the small population states—with the appropriation at any level, those states get $50,000 as a minimum, and then it rises according to population.

When the first appropriation was made five years ago, it was at $5 million so we had a range of $50,000 to about $450,000. As the Congress has chosen to increase the appropriation, we now have the larger states having received significant increases while the small states are still hovering at or slightly above $50,000.

It is our viewpoint, after interviewing and discussing with coordinators of these funds out in the field, that those small population states would greatly benefit by having that floor doubled to $100,000.

Now, we're not saying that if you, for whatever reason, go back to a very small appropriation of, let's say, $5 or $7 million nationally, that these small states should get that money. We're saying if you could write into the reauthorization something that would indicate that any time that the appropriation exceeds half of the authorization—that is, $10 million—at that point we would like to see these smaller, which tend to be rural states, getting $100,000.

The two things that we've really heard from the field on that point are, one, that they are giving out these seed grants to the communities, but they don't even have any staff time to go and monitor and see what became of the grants. Thirty thousands dollars, which is 60 percent of $50,000, if you put it out into the field, you've got nothing left to go out and monitor and evaluate what you've done.

Secondly, these states are very dispersed and very rural for the most part, these small population states. Just to get some contact with people in the more removed areas of the state, they need a somewhat larger grant.

So, that would be the one change that we would like to make. Finally, again I would like to congratulate you for having enacted a very effective piece of legislation. I hope you'll read a little bit more about the details of why it's been good in the book and in the testimony I've submitted.

I'd like to just close by saying that if you have no other reason for reauthorizing this bill, reauthorize it because of a place called The Living Room. The Living Room is a school-age child care program in Naples, Florida. A principal of a school down there said that if his kids were not going to be able to have a mother or a father or a grandmother, or somebody, to go home to at the end of the day, then, by God, they weren't going to go home to any institutionalized-looking kind of place either. They were going to go home to a living room.

He used money from the Dependent Care Grant Act to refurbish a portable classroom and to set up a program which is called The Living Room. That's where those boys and girls go after school. To a nice comfortable place where they can relax and hang out and talk to some caring adults.

That's the kind of alternative that this Dependent Care Grant Act is making possible for the children of our country. Thanks.

[The prepared statement of Dale B. Fink follows:]

TESTIMONY OF Dale B. Fink, Senior Project Associate
Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, Massachusetts
February 20, 1990

EDUCATION AND LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THE DEPENDENT CARE GRANTS: HOW A FEW FEDERAL DOLLARS HAVE MADE AN ENORMOUS IMPACT ON AN EMERGING FIELD

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee: I appreciate the opportunity to offer testimony and I applaud the interest of this committee in the quality of life for America's children in a time of great changes in the demographics, culture, and economics of our nation's families.

My testimony today touches on one of the two pieces of legislation that you are examining here--the vehicle for reauthorization of what are known as the Dependent Care Grants. The authorization for this act expires this fiscal year after having received six years of authorization, and five years of appropriation. I am here to recommend very strongly the reauthorization of this act and to explain to you how a relatively small new federal stream of funds has galvanized interest and activity in an important new issue all across this country.

I am part of a small research group at Wellesley College in Massachusetts, called the School-Age Child Care Project, which has been an important national resource since 1979 for those developing programs and policies relating to the so-called "latchkey" issue. Through our research, consultation, training, and publications, we assist school districts, parent groups, nonprofit organizations, corporations, mayors, governors, state legislatures and many others in the development of appropriate programs so that children do not have to be left to fend for themselves just because their school schedules are not well-matched with their parents' employment schedules.

We help people design appropriate programs that offer care, recreation, enrichment, challenge and fun to school-age children from five years old to adolescence, in an atmosphere that fosters independence, choice-making, and community exploration on the part of school-age children and youth. I am pleased to make available today, in addition to copies of my testimony, some copies of our latest publication, co-authored by myself and our Project Director, Michelle Seligson. It is a concise overview of the recent policy developments in this field, called *No Time To Waste: An Action Agenda for School-Age Child Care.*

In this book we developed and discussed 15 ACTION RECOMMENDATIONS The second one on our list is the reauthorization of the Dependent Care Grant program. We believe it should be reauthorized for another four years, and we would like to see it fully funded at the $20 million level. We also recommended, based on our discussions with the coordinators of the funds in the states, that the floor-level appropriation for states with small populations should be raised from $50,000 to $100,000 whenever the appropriation exceeds $10 million.

Why, you might wonder, did we give such high priority to this piece of legislation, in a book in which we wrote about a range of other responses to the latchkey problem at the state, local, and national level, many of which, measured in dollars, have been much more substantial than this one? I'll tell you why we gave it such high priority. Because this federal program has been successful beyond the wildest dreams of anyone in the newly emerging field of school-age child care. It has placed the issue of before- and after-school care for school-age children on the map in many states which had previously not recognized it. It has given rise to many grass roots efforts which just needed a little infusion of financial resources to get them off the ground. It has allowed many states to hold their first statewide and regional conferences on before- and after-school care for children. It has stimulated many local and state governments and private providers toward interagency collaboration across the lines of education, child care, recreation, public health, social services, public welfare, and other related fields. It has allowed for training, so that the response to school-age kids with working parents is not to warehouse them in a cafeteria or a gym and keep them off the streets for a few hours but to involve them in meaningful, appropriate and creative activities. It has fostered an important examination in many places of child care regulations, most of which were written with programs serving younger preschool children in mind, and often include requirements not completely relevant and omit others very important to this older child population.

I don't mind telling you that many advocates of school-age child care were disappointed in 1984 when this act was first passed. Perhaps a little history will clarify for you why we were skeptical back then and so enthusiastic now.

History of the dependent care grant

In May of 1984 the House of Representatives passed by unanimous vote an act allocating $30 million a year for three years for school-age child care. It would have authorized grants to school districts and nonprofit organizations, allowing them to spend the money on operational expenses or start-up activities and also would have created a national clearinghouse for information and technical assistance on this issue. On the Senate side, however, this "School Facilities Child Care Act" never got out of Committee. Meanwhile, the same thing happened with a bill supporting resource-and-referral funding nationwide.

To break this impasse, proponents and opponents of the measures came together on a compromise, in which they combined the school-age child care bill with the resource-and-referral bill. They eliminated the federal clearinghouse, changed the allocation mechanism to a state-administered grant program, narrowly defined the objectives as start-up, expansion and improvement, established the school-age portion as 60% in this bill (whereas it would have been 100% in the School Facilities Child Care Act), and cut the total authorization from $30 million for three years to $20 million for only two years.

You can easily appreciate that people felt disappointed at the prospect of the entire school-age child care field nationally receiving only 60% of $40 million ($24 million), when the figure of $90 million itself had seemed a mere drop in the bucket, given the estimates of latchkey children running into the millions, and growing, and combined with the loss of the federal clearinghouse and the removal of operational funds it seemed an altogether limited contribution to a major social problem. On top of that, it got off to a very slow start, with no funds appropriated the first year and just $5 million in the second and final year of its original authorization--reduced even a bit more by Graham-Rudman-Hollings. But then it began to happen: the school-age child care field got its chance to show just how resourceful it could be with a small amount of money. Some states passed the funds, which ranged at the beginning from $50,000 in about 20 states to approximately $450,000 in California, through Education Departments; others through Human Services or Social Services or Public Welfare or through state universities or other agencies. Many created brand new programs. Others, such as Pennsylvania, merged the federal dollars with funding streams that had already been initiated at the state level.

The 1986 session of Congress reauthorized the Dependent Care Grants for four more years. The authorization level remained at $20 million. The fiscal 1987 appropriation was once again $5 million, and it has climbed higher each year since then, to $13.2 million in fiscal 1990.

And now I'd like to illustrate just how the grant has been spent--at least the 60% of it that is for school-age child care--and make sure you understand how this little measure has made such a big difference to this field. Let me describe to you how four different states have used the grant. I have chosen them not because they are exceptional but because they illustrate the enormous range of possibilities. Those three words that Congress wrote into the authorization--"start-up, expansion, and improvement"--which many of us once thought would be too restrictive to be useful, have proved their worthiness on the front lines.

The legacy of the grant: hundreds more programs; tens of thousands more children in care; the first professional development efforts in this field

Vermont has always received the minimum Dependent Care Grant of $50,000 and has funnelled it through the Department of Human Services. Of the $30,000 designated for SACC, three-quarters or more has been put into seed grants of from $300 to $2300 to go right out into the field. The Child Care Services Division reports that there has been a 300% increase in licensed school-age child care since 1985, and that 75% of all programs started in that period have received funds through the Dependent Care Grant. The balance has been used for conferences and training. Among the programs receiving seed grants have been a Satellite Family Day Care Program, where family day care providers are recruited by a Children's Center to take children into their homes before and after school. In another Vermont community, two independent school districts receiving a grant joined together to transport children to one program. In another town, a school-age component was added to a child care center housed in a convalescent home, with the aim of incorporating intergenerational programs as part of the curriculum.

In Tennessee, the Department of Human Services (DHS) is the grantee. They created a statewide task force of citizens, which led first to a checklist to help parents evaluate the quality of programs for school-agers. Then a start-up manual and public service announcements for local radio stations were developed. In more

recent years, seed grants in the $2000 to $10,000 range have been one of the major ways the grant has been used. DHS estimates that of approximately 100 new licensed school-age child care programs since 1985, 87 got off the ground with the help of the dependent care grant.

In Alabama, the Community Education Division of the State Department of Education is the grantee. That office has focussed on two major goals: the dissemination of information on school-age child care to families in need of it, particularly low-income families, and the establishment of model programs in school districts. They contracted with the Alabama Congress of Parents and Teachers to send a newsletter on school-age child care programs to the parents of all elementary and middle-school age children in the state. Also, they worked with the Department of Human Resources to reach AFDC and other low-income families. Information packets detailing the availability of school-age child care programs, possible sources of financial aid, alternatives to self-care and a toll-free resource and referral number have been enclosed with AFDC checks and food stamps. As for school districts, where there were only 3 districts with Extended Day Programs in 1985, there are now at least 43, and the enrollment was estimated last year at over 15,000.

The Minnesota Department of Education has been the grantee for that state's Dependent Care Grant. After several years of information and consultation for child care providers, school principals and superintendents, they reported last year that there were 55 more school districts with school-age child care programs than in 1985, and estimated that the total numbers attending programs had doubled in that time period.

Here are some more reports we received in response to a survey we conducted in 1989--just the "bottom line."

MICHIGAN: approximately 5000 more children in school-age child care since 1985

NEW HAMPSHIRE: over 400 slots for school-agers created since 1985; that represented more than a 40% increase

NEW JERSEY: approximately 217 new programs since 1985

NEW YORK: approximately 300 new programs serving over 10,000 children

OREGON: an increase from 80 school-based sites to 115

PENNSYLVANIA: 352 new programs with 7000 slots for school-age children

RHODE ISLAND: 30 new programs; 900 slots

UTAH: 15 new programs serving 375 children

The "start-up, expansion and improvement" in the school-age portion of the Dependent Care Grant has been very successful--but a vehicle is still needed for subsidy and operational expenses

I hope the picture is clear. We are talking about this grant having been leveraged to create hundreds and hundreds of programs across this country, serving tens of thousands of children whose parents would previously have had to forego

employment opportunities in order to provide before- and after-school care, or would have faced the prospect of sending their children to an empty home, with the television and the refrigerator as their primary companions.

In addition, we are talking about the very first professional development opportunities for most people working in this field, where people working with children before and after school have begun to take themselves seriously as professionals, with a mission vital to the well-being of their communities.

And remember, this money is not being used for pay for ongoing operations, only for "start-up, expansion, and improvement." The ongoing participation of the children in all the programs I just referred to is being paid for by their parents or subsidized by other public or private funds.

Unfortunately, in some communities, grants for start-up, expansion, and improvement are ineffective because so many families cannot afford the fees for ongoing operations and there are no alternative sources of funding. There is a desperate need for more subsidy for low and moderate income families to access school-age child care. That needs to be addressed by the Congress. In our book, *No Time To Waste*, we said we would like to see it addressed through another vehicle--comprehensive child care legislation, such as you have been considering over the past year. Legislation such as ABC/HR3 could provide subsidy funds for families with all ages of children in need of care, from infancy through early adolescence. If such legislation were to be passed, we see the value of maintaining the current more narrow definition of the purposes of the dependent care grant--at least as pertaining to the 60% that relates to school-age child care. As to any possible revisions in the definitions and exclusions in the *resource-and-referral* portion of the grant: that is a question you should put to those in the resource-and-referral field. The two fields--resource-and-referral and school-age child care--though lodged here in the same legislative vehicle--are not parallel with one another in their mode of development.

Why raise the floor from $50,000 to $100,000 for small states?

There is, however, one change we would recommend, and we mentioned it in our book, in our ACTION RECOMMENDATION referenced earlier. We would like to see the floor appropriation fixed at $100,000 whenever the amount of the appropriation is above $10 million. Large population states have seen significant increase as the appropriation has climbed from $5 million to $13.2 million. The smaller-population states have risen just a little above the $50,000 floor--or in some cases stayed on the floor. Remember, when we say a state is receiving $50,000, it is receiving just $30,000 for the school-age child care portion. We noted that three-fourths of all the new school-age child care programs in Vermont since 1985 have gotten off the ground with the help of these federal dollars--all that was accomplished with just $30,000 a year! But discussions with coordinators of these funds in some of the smaller population states have made it clear that with a few more resources, their efforts could multiply significantly.

There are two main reasons why this change would be justified. First: those administering the funds would be enabled to follow-up and examine the results achieved by these funds once they've been disbursed into the field. Second: those administering the funds would be better able to offer assistance to outlying and rural areas. As you are probably aware, the small-population states are primarily rural and in many cases geographically immense. The difference in these states

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

between $30,000 a year and $60,000 a year for school-age child care would be very noticeable, much more noticeable, I would say, than the loss of a small part of their increase would be in the larger states.

If the annual appropriation for this legislation should once again fall to half or less of the $20 million current authorization level, then these low-population states should continue to live with the $50,000 floor. But we feel that any time the appropriation is above half of the current authorization--as it has been the past two fiscal years--then the floor should rise to $100,000.

Putting the amount of this authorization in context

This dependent care grant is not a great pot of money, yet it has had enormous and very positive ramifications. According to a Census Bureau Report, "Who's Minding the Kids?," American parents are currently spending $11 billion annually out of their own pockets on various child care arrangements. The federal child care tax credit, as you probably know, costs the federal treasury additional billions annually--$3.4 billion in FY 1988 is the most recent figure that I have.
We can assure you that if you re-authorize this small piece of legislation and make the corresponding appropriations, you will be able to continue to be proud of the results it produces.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Fink.

Ms. Burkhart.

Ms. BURKHART. Thank you, and good afternoon. I appreciate the opportunity this afternoon to speak with you about how a local school system has implemented and utilized the Dependent Care Grants.

The public school system in Washington County, Maryland has been supportive of the concept of school-age child care for many, many years. But it's only been recently that it has become a reality. The reason for that, as with many of the school districts in this country, has been funding.

The first program that was actually begun in Washington County only three years ago tried three years prior to that to get enough funding to begin a program. It began as a result, after three years, of donations mostly from individuals and small businesses in that community.

After one year of operation, the program was able to continue with the assistance of a Dependent Care Grant. This allowed the program to expand its number of children and to offer a quality school-age child care program at a minimum of expense to parents without the fear of closing the program the next year.

Although start-up costs may seem insignificant to many, the task of raising $3,000 to begin a program so the materials can be purchased and so that insurance costs can be covered, becomes overwhelming for many small school districts. The Board of Education in Washington County has been very supportive in making it possible to provide the facility and utilities, and even some custodial services for Washington County to be able to provide the school-age child care programs.

This is not the case in many of the school districts throughout the country, however. Consequently, the start-up costs for the programs in these districts are prohibitive. The Dependent Care Grants in Washington County and throughout the State of Maryland have made it possible for school districts to begin programs for the safety, protection and care of our children.

In Washington County, Maryland alone Dependent Care Grants have supplied that extra funding which allowed us to continue the first program, which was struggling financially, and it supplied enough supplemental funding for start-up to begin four additional programs this year in September.

As a result of the coordination of interagency resources and efforts by the Board of Education, the additional funding from the Dependent Care Grants has been utilized to train approximately 200 persons in our community. It has also been used to train them in such areas as Red Cross first aid, child health and safety, recognizing child abuse, nutrition, appropriate management and discipline techniques to be used for children, and programming for special needs children after school.

It has been used to also purchase needed materials that were not available and to provide supplemental insurance costs which in this country right now range from $35 to $75 nationally.

The Dependent Care Grant also has provided funding for the creation of a Child Care Activities Guide in our community that has been distributed not just to those programs that have school-age

child care programs but to all programs in the community that have children. Those that are profit and non-profit.

As a result, also, of the Dependent Care Grants to Washington County, the fee charged to parents has been kept at a minimum, ranging from $1.00 to $1.75 per hour. Because the need for school-age child care right now exists largely with low and lower middle income families, this low cost to parents has allowed us to serve children who might otherwise be home alone before and/or after school.

While our program capacity has tripled in two years, we have not begun to meet the needs. During the summer of 1988 the Washington County Commissioners appointed a committee to assess the need for school-age child care programs in Washington County.

Analysis of the committee's report concluded that while family day care homes and some day care centers accept school-age child care children, most prefer children who are younger for two reasons. One is that it's easier to keep them there all day than to have them coming and going. The other is it provides full day funding for the provider.

The family day care home situation in our community is also very similar. The fact is there simply are not enough school-age child care or any age child care providers in Washington County at this current time.

The Dependent Care Grants have made it possible to provide school-age child care programs in the public schools in order to begin to meet the growing demand for child care services for before and after school.

In addition, the survey conducted by the committee involving students in 32 schools showed that approximately 30 percent of the parents surveyed needed before school care and approximately 43 percent of the parents surveyed needed after school care for their children.

In general, this means that one-third of the parents surveyed would utilize before and/or after school child care services. There are over 13,000 children in our public schools right now between the ages of 4 and 14. Roughly this means that perhaps 4,000 to 5,000 children need before and/or after school care services in Washington County alone.

When one considers the fact that the Washington County public schools serve 13,000 students and the fact that we are only able to provide services in our public schools to 175 students, I believe the need is very clear.

Dependent Care Grant has allowed a small rural school system the opportunity to expand its program to meet the needs of 175 children. Washington County alone could quadruple this number and still not accommodate the numbers of school-age children in need of care.

It is imperative that dependent care grants be continued in order to supplement the costs of these programs so that expansion and training opportunities are available and so that quality, safe, affordable programs can be initiated and expanded for the protection and care of the Nation's children.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the reauthorization of the Federal Dependent Care Development Grant Program, focusing on the necessity for start-up funding, for direct services for children, for training, and for expansion of services to school-age child care programs in public schools. Local inter-agency effort must be maintained as well as networking of state departments of education with departments of human resources.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Jill Burkhart follows:]

TESTIMONY
FOR
THE FEDERAL DEPENDENT CARE
DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROGRAM

PREPARED BY

JILL BUPKHART
WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,
HAGERSTOWN, MARYLAND

FOR

HOUSE EDUCATION & LABOR COMMITTEE
HUMAN RESOURCES SUB COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 20, 1990

In the State of Maryland -

Incentive Grants funded through the Federal Dependent Care Development Grant Program are being implemented as follows:

BALTIMORE CITY

-to provide start-up funds for establishment of school-age child care centers serving (4 to 12 year old children) in three Baltimore City Public Schools (#27), #83, #261)

-to work with the Mayor's Office of Children and Youth to implement training programs for prospective family child care providers

-to work with the Mayor's Office of children and Youth to form and facilitate a coordinated local interagency School-Age Care Council

BALTIMORE COUNTY

-to develop and test a training process to assist child care providers in understanding and complying with the licensing regulations. It would also help potential providers in opening new centers.

CALVERT COUNTY

-to offer a Community college course, "Effective Programming and Disciplining in School Age Child Care" to currently employed day care center operators.

CHARLES COUNTY

-to expand support of the Board of Education to the extent possible through dependent care funds, by providing a consultant for child care program staff development, funds for a field trip, and by purchasing furniture and equipment to create an aesthetically pleasing environment for the program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Public School System in Washington County, Maryland has been supportive of the concept of School Age Child Care for many years, but it has been only recently that School Age Child Care has become a reality.

Washington County, like many mostly rural communities in this country struggled with implementing School Age Child Care for one primary reason: Funding. The first program that was begun in Washington County only three years ago tried unsuccessfully for three years prior to that time to obtain enough funding and support to begin the program. It began as a result of donations, mostly from individuals and small community businesses. After one year of operation, the program was able to continue with the assistance of a Dependent Care Grant which allowed the program to expand its number of children and to offer a quality school age child care program at minimum expense to parents, without the fear of closing the program the next year.

Although start-up costs may seem insignificant to many, the task of raising $3000 to begin a program so that materials are available, and so that insurance costs are covered becomes overwhelming for small school districts. The Board of Education in Washington County makes the program possible by providing the facility, utilities and some custodial services at no charge to the School Age Child Care Program or group as long as the group is non-profit. This is not the case in many of the School Districts, however; and consequently, the start-up costs for the program in those districts are prohibitive. The Dependent Care Grants in Washington County, Maryland and throughout the State have made it possible for School Districts to begin programs for the safety, protection and care of children.

In Washington County, Maryland the Dependent Care Grants supplied that extra funding which allowed us to continue the first program, which was struggling financially, and supplied enough supplemental start-up funding to begin four additional programs in September, 1989. As a result of coordination of Interagency resources and efforts by the Board of Education, the additional funding has been utilized to train approximately 200 persons in such areas as Red Cross First Aid, Child Health, Recognizing Child Abuse, Nutrition, Appropriate Management and Discipline Techniques and programming for Special Needs Children. It has been used to purchase needed materials and to supplement insurance costs which range from $35 to $75 per child nationally. The Dependent Care Grant also provided funding for the creation of a School Age Child Care Activities Guide to be disseminated to all Child Care Programs, Profit and Non-Profit, Public or Private, in Washington County.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KENT COUNTY (continued)

expand current school-age child care services to eligible school-age participants through direct financial awards to low-income parents.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

-to develop an educational program for family and center school-age child care providers delivered through a school-based parent resource center at New Hampshire Estates Elementary School.

-to support developmentally appropriate practices in school and care settings through a) workshops for day care providers; b) workshops for parents; c) the use of interagency resources by providers and parents; and d) ongoing access to the parent resource center.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY

-to provide staff development for Coordinators, Instructional Aides, and Group Activity Assistants to enhance the school system's child care programs.

-to include activities such as classroom management techniques, basic child development theories, development of activities appropriate for various age groups, first aid, and building good home/school relations.

ST. MARY'S COUNTY

-to establish the first School-Age Child Care Centers for before-and-after-school care in St. Mary's County.

TALBOT COUNTY

-to help subsidize our proposed four-year old program. Several areas will benefit from this allocation for funds; such as providing interest training in areas of whole language development and approach and the purchase of age appropriate materials for students.

-4-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DORCHESTER COUNTY

-to analyze the survey data and recommendations of the school-age child committee and develop a plan that will enable us to accomplish the recommendations.

-to determine a variety of ways to make parents aware of the need for child care and ways to make it available to all parents who desire it.

-to determine ways to expand after-school program to other sites and implement a before-school program.

FREDERICK COUNTY

-to offer interagency opportunities for four and five year old high risk students in Frederick County.

-to continue and extend our current efforts.

HARFORD COUNTY

-to insure the success of the pilot school-age child care program.

-to disseminate information about school-age child care programs in Harford County.

-to educate parents, citizens, and community leaders about the need for quality school-age child care.

-to enhance the professional development of day care providers and facilitate licensing.

KENT COUNTY

-To expand the Garnett Student Care, Inc. school-age child care service at the H.H. Garnett Elementary School through the following initiatives:

inservice staff so as to increase their knowledge and skill in working with handicapped children.

purchase materials and equipment to meet the needs of handicapped children.

-3-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WASHINGTON COUNTY

-to expand current school-age child care services and activities to current school-age child care programs operating in the Washington County Public Schools.

As a result of the Dependent Care Grants to Washington County, the fee charged to parents has been kept at a minimum, ranging from $1.00 to $1.75 per hour. Because the need for care for school-aged children exists largely in low to middle income families, this low cost to parents has allowed us to serve children who might otherwise be home alone before and/or after school.

While our program capacity has tripled in two years, we have not begun to meet the need. During the summer of 1988, the Washington County Commissioners appointed a Committee to assess the need for School Age Child Care Programs. Analysis of the Committees Report is as follows:

1. Current Services

There are 325 registered family day care providers in the county, 17 licensed day care centers, two school-based centers and one planned, and a church sponsored center, plus the Fort Ritchie Center. Of the 325 family day care providers, 240 accept children for before and after-school care during the summer. Only one -third (33%) will provide care during the holidays, and another one-third (33%) provide care for some holidays. Five of the 17 day care centers offer after-school care, six offer before-school care, and four centers provide summer care for younger children. The recreation commission provides community center programs after school and summer playground programs. The library does not have any before or after-school programs. The YMCA has two-week sessions of summer camp.

However, while family day care homes and centers accept school age children, many prefer children who are younger because of the licensing requirements and the fact that full day children provide a full day of income for the provider. Additionally, all centers in Washington County are currently at full capacity with large waiting lists for the next year. The family day care home situation is very similar. The fact is, there simply are not enough school age or any age child care providers in Washington County at the current time.

-5-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Current Policies

According to Section 6.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, single, rural, residential-rural, and multiple residential districts require Zoning Board authorization after a public hearing, as do nursery schools and child care centers. In agricultural districts, permits can be issued without a special hearing. Section 7.4 sets building height requirements.

The procedure for establishing before and after-school care in school facilities is that a non-profit incorporated group may apply for permission. The group is responsible for staffing, funding, supplies, equipment and liability insurance. The School Board will provide the facility, utilities, custodial care and a liaison person. The procedure is in effect but is not in writing. Non-profit groups find that getting parents to serve on a board of directors and obtaining affordable insurance are their greatest problems. Transportation to and from the centers is the responsibility of parents.

3. Survey Results on Need for Services

The survey of 32 elementary and middle schools provided the following information: In response to questions about what parents need and would use, an average of 30 percent needed child care before school and 43 percent after school. An average of 11 percent also needed care on weekends and holidays, 21 percent during school vacations, and 12 percent if schools are closed.

In general, this means one third of the parents surveyed would utilize before and after-school child care. There are over 13,000 children between the ages of 4 and 14 in the county. This means that perhaps 4,000 need before-school care, and over 5,000 need after school-care.

Recommendations for Action as a result of the survey indicated:

1. Open additional before and after-school child care programs in public schools. There are two in operation and one planned. However there are waiting lists at proprietary, non-profit centers, and for family day care homes, so school age programs are severely limited.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. The Washington County Commissioners and/or the State of Maryland provide grants to help with start up costs. Forty-three percent (43%) of those surveyed indicated they would use after-school care in the schools.

3. The Washington County Commissioners and/or State of Maryland provide liability insurance coverage to non-profit agencies for the first year or two.

4. The Board of Education establish written policies for school-based before and after-school programs.

When one considers the fact that the Washington County Public Schools serve approximately 13,000 students grades Pre-Kindergarten through eight, and the fact that we are only able to provide programs to 175 students, the need is clear.

The Dependent Care Grant has allowed a small, rural school system the opportunity to expand its program to meet the needs of 175 children. Washington County, alone, could quadruple this number and still not accommodate the numbers of school age children in need of care. It is imperative that Dependent Care Grants be continued in order to supplement the cost of these programs so that expansion and training opportunities are available, and so that quality, safe, affordable programs can be initiated and expanded for the protection and care of the nation's children.

I strongly urge you to consider reauthorization of the Federal Dependent Care Development Grant Program focusing on the necessity for start up funding for direct services to children; training; and expansion of services to School Age Child Care Programs. Local Interagency effort must be maintained, as well as networking of State Departments of Education with Departments of Human Resources.

-7-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much.

All your testimony has been very good here. I can't really find any area where I would disagree. I wish we had not just more money but better priorities in the government. We could do a lot more if I could get the cost maybe of one customized coffee pot for a B-2 bomber, I might be able to pay for some of these programs right here.

That's our job. I serve not only on the Education and Labor Committee, but I serve on the Budget Committee. The big decision in the Budget Committee is not so much dollars as priorities. You set your priorities first and see how much money you have for those priorities. Very often those that already have high priority, hold on to their dollars and those that don't, have a difficult time getting their dollars.

So I try to approach the budget process not from the bottom line, the dollars, but from the priority point of view. I think this is a very high priority.

Things are changing in the world. All the experts on Eastern Europe of one year ago were all wrong, thank God. It's nice to have experts wrong at times, but things are really changing and I think we have an opportunity to take programs, very small programs like this—these are programs that would not even be a blip on Dick Cheney's computer over at the Defense Department. Wouldn't even be a blip.

But to, say, double these programs or triple these programs, would still not create a blip over there but it would make a significant difference in these programs.

So, our job both in the Education and Labor Committee and the Human Resources Subcommittee, and in the Budget Committee, is to really look at what the priorities of America are today and I suggest that children are a very, very high priority.

From time to time I have visited the National Zoo here in Washington, DC. When I first came to Washington my kids were 4, 5 and 6. We used to go out more frequently then. Having gone to the zoo, I noticed many things.

I did note, however, that probably the zoo keepers, the people that work in the zoo out there, were not being paid enough, and I still believe that to be the case. But they are making more than child care workers in Washington, DC.

There is something fundamentally wrong when that takes place. I certainly will not help child care workers by taking money away from those that work at the National Zoo. They earn everything that they make there and probably should get more. But when we recognize that we really expect almost some charitable contributions from poor people to provide child care, that's a very, very shaky foundation for child care in this country.

That's what we really require when we require of the poor—say, we'll pay you five bucks an hour and you'll make $11,000 a year, right? The rest of it just, you know, feel good about yourself because you're helping.

But we can't build a child care structure on such a flimsy basis. We wouldn't get many people working at the National Zoo for that.

So, I really think that we have to address this in a very massive way. I really believe we have to reauthorize these bills, do better in

reauthorizing them, try to get the appropriations process to catch up to whatever we do in the authorization process.

I also agree with, I'm sure, all of you, and you mentioned this specifically, Mr. Fink, that we really need a child care bill. We are still working hard on that. We've been assured by the Speaker of the House, Mr. Foley, that we will have a bill passed by the end of March. So, we're working very hard on that, to secure that.

These really complement whatever we do there. These are complementary to that. So, we're going to pursue these paths in child care right here. That's part of my speech. I'm preaching to the choir here. I know that.

Really, you people are out there and you provide such expertise to us here in the Congress—not only your knowledge or your commitment, which is very, very important. One of the advantages of serving here in the Congress of the United States is that you really have the opportunity of getting something similar to a master's degree or a Ph.D. with people like yourself out there informing us and inspiring us as to what we should do.

Let me ask a few questions before I lose my voice completely here. Dr. Phillips, you suggest that including training costs as an allowable use of funds would enable greater numbers of people to participate in the CDA program.

How do they get their training now under the present arrangement?

Dr. PHILLIPS. Training arrangements vary widely. For the 80 percent of the CDA's who were credentialed while they were employed by Head Start programs, the employer supports the training costs. Head Start has been the major contributor to that.

There are some employers beyond the Head Start system, but few, that will also support the training costs for employees.

The training network consists of a two year college and university—community colleges provide a lot of CDA training. Some four-year universities, but few, and private consultants who are employed or hired by child care programs, as well as program staff who train the employees once they are hired.

So, it comes through a diverse arrangement.

Mr. KILDEE. So you would ask for some flexibility within this where some of the money could be used for training costs. Of course, if we gave everyone the training costs, it would diminish the number of people if we didn't significantly raise the appropriation. But you still feel that some flexibility would maybe enable you to look at a person that would not be able to get training in any other fashion, and so we can also help out in the training cost? Is that what you're asking?

Dr. PHILLIPS. Yes. This is based on what we heard from the scholarship agency administrators—we heard that, even given the same number of dollars, increased flexibility in how scholarships were awarded—flexibility to allow some monies to be used for training—would help increase the utilization of the scholarships.

Given the income eligibility restrictions, no one can become a CDA without having been trained first. Therefore, people are income eligible and want to become credentialed, but if they have absolutely no resources for training, they simply can't use the scholarship awards.

Mr. KILDEE. Does anyone else have any——

Dr. PHILLIPS. That is true in New York.

Mr. KILDEE. You would concur with basically that.

Dr. Fink, leaving children home unattended creates a great deal of problems for the children obviously, perhaps some problems for society too. What type of problems does it create for their parents? Do you have any experience with that?

Mr. FINK. In some cases it causes parents who don't want to allow that to happen to take themselves out of the employment force altogether. There have been many parents who have said that—for instance, public housing residents in the City of Boston were surveyed many comprehensively and many of them identified lack of after school day care and lack of summer care for school-age kids as the reason why they were not seeking employment or seeking full-time employment.

But for those parents who do go ahead and take jobs, even though their children have to be home, it creates a tremendous amount of stress. It also creates a lack of productivity.

Business has identified something they call the Three O'clock Syndrome that the parents are on the phone trying to find out if everything is okay at home while the person should be working.

Mr. KILDEE. I note that myself as I'm a Congressman and an employer. I encourage that. I hire my staff, you know, for having good heads and good hearts both. Good hearts have to attend to their own children. But I do notice that after school—not so much any more, the one I have in mind, the child is older—but they obviously have to show some concern. I'm sure in some businesses the telephones are really pretty hot after 3:00, or whatever hour the school may get out, because of that.

I've noted in Flint, Michigan that several things keep people on welfare. Of the two most common things that keep people on welfare is the fact that they will lose their Medicaid card—which is stupid and we're trying to undo that under the Welfare Reform Act. I'm not sure that's being implemented in the states. But it's stupid.

I mean, I've gotten jobs for many—usually it's a woman who is so happy to get that job because she really wants to get off welfare and then finds out that cold turkey she loses the Medicaid card and she has two or three or four children whose health is not that great. She says, "I can't do it." I agree with her. You know, I don't know how government can be so stupid, but having been in Washington for a while it's easier to understand that.

[Laughter.]

Mr. KILDEE. But it's hard. Then, the other thing is lack of reliable child care. Those two things, I think more than anything else, keep people off the payrolls and on the welfare roles.

Just from a humanitarian point of view we know why we should do these things. But just from a fiscal point of view, we can help welfare recipients become contributors to the Treasury—when they don't draw upon the Treasury that makes fiscal good sense also.

So, I can understand why it is a stressful situation for parents, very often to the point where they feel that their best role as a parent is then to stay at home.

Mr. FINK. Mr. Chairman, if I might embellish. Then, of course, that means often a loss in their own income and it also means a loss to the economy.

Mr. KILDEE. Absolutely. It doesn't make good economic sense at all when we do that. We should be wise enough to figure that out and try to find some way to address that.

Ms. Burkhart, you mentioned that school-age services are provided for children up to age of 12 in Washington County. Why is it important to serve children 12 years of age?

Ms. BURKHART. Basically I think many parents are not comfortable leaving their 12-year-old child home alone for two or three hours. As a parent of a four-year-old child, I face the situation of what's going to happen next year when my child goes to school. I have wonderful child care now, but I also have to look at what's going to happen at 3:00 when my child or I have to make a decision.

Many parents, including myself, would not leave a 12-year-old child home in a rural part of a community with no one even close by. I think sometimes even up to the age of 14 it becomes important to have at least some person or program responsible for that child from 3:00 until 5:30 or 6:00 when the parent or some responsible adult is able to then look after that child.

Mr. KILDEE. You know, as a parent of—I used to say of three teenagers, but as of this month I have two teenagers and one 20-year-old now—you know, you wonder why—and my kids are all doing well—you wonder why certain kids get through this kind of danger period and others don't.

I don't know what the formula is. I try to struggle with that. I think a lot of it is giving love and expressing love and let kids know they are loved. We use the word "love" in our family a lot. So far, empirically, it seems to work in my own family.

But you really look for the formula. But age 12, 13, 14—those ages are years where kids can begin to experiment in many areas. Left alone or left together, you know, we really are playing with something I think potentially very, very dangerous. We have to address that.

That's why latchkey programs or various types of programs that address the problems that latchkey tries to address—because there can be a variety of modalities of addressing this—such as the Living Room program.

When I was teaching school—and I tell people in my real life I was a school teacher—we used to have a teen club which generally started at 6:00, but I generally would stay there at least on Wednesday night right after school so kids could stay until it was time to go home after teen club, or whatever time they had to go home.

I remember Wednesday night was generally a night that many parents look forward to because they knew that the school would be open until maybe—well, actually, it would be open until about 8:00 at night then, with teen club starting at 6:00.

But it provided a service. The school was already there. As I said, there's various modalities to serve those children who are served by latchkey programs. But that age group, those early teens—cer-

tainly 12 years old and I think 13 and 14 years old—are areas where we have to have concern too and address that.

Does anyone have any further comments on that?

Mr. FINK. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wanted you to know that on the Dependent Care Grants there are several states specifically that have targeted part of their funding to start up and improve services for that age group, what they call a middle school age group from about 11 to 14.

I know that Minnesota, Tennessee, Pennsylvania—and I'm sure there are a number of others, but those come to mind—because we have been surveying and been in touch with the states and I know that more and more of this issue has been identified. What do we do with the kids as they're leaving the elementary age? We still need to offer them some role models, some positive recreation, perhaps some community service.

All kinds of other things come into it as you get past the age of ten or so. That's what they're trying to use this grant innovatively to work on.

Mr. KILDEE. Ms. Lamm.

Ms. LAMM. I would also ask, Mr. Chairman, that you and your colleagues remember this as you look at other kinds of legislation that affect children in this age group, including the other comprehensive proposals and the welfare reform itself, which stops at 12, and creates a problem.

I have a personal emotional response to this because my own child has just aged out of school-age child care and I feel like at 13 he's the most vulnerable he's ever been in his life and he's exposed to all kinds of things that he was never exposed to before. If there's ever a time that I felt like I shouldn't be working or I should be working part-time so I could spend more time with him, it's now. I feel very strongly about that. It's a good point.

Mr. KILDEE. My kids now are 17, 18 and 20 and I feel I'm pretty well home clear right now. They all have been good kids, but you do worry.

Those junior high years are really years where physically they are able to take care of their own needs much more than when they're toddlers, certainly physically. But there's other needs besides physical needs.

Mr. FINK. They can even dye their own hair at age 12, right?

[Laughter.]

Mr. KILDEE. But there are other needs and other pitfalls. They are in the process of making some decisions which would go—a lot of peer pressure on there too. So, it's extremely important.

Ms. Lamm, the committee has been informed that in some states the low eligibility level has precluded some potential CDA candidates from receiving scholarships. Have you had any experience in that regard?

Ms. LAMM. Yes. In New York we try very, very hard to recruit every possible scholarship recipient. We mailed to every person to had ever contacted the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition requesting information about the CDA. We mailed to each of them. We mailed to every licensed day care program in the state. We mailed to every community college and four-year college that offers child care courses.

Out of all of those recruitment efforts we've only been able to award 30 scholarships. One of the things that we're told by the people in communities who are working with CDA candidates is that the eligibility guidelines are just too low.

That even with day care wages being as low as they are, people are not able to afford to live on those wages so there's a second income in the household usually, which puts the candidate over the eligibility guidelines and yet still not able to get rich.

Mr. KILDEE. So you would suggest either a change or some flexibility in the 150 percent of poverty then?

Ms. LAMM. Absolutely. What I would like to see is up to 125 percent of the state median income. Of course, for New York that's a real issue because in most of our counties the poverty level is just way below even subsistence level. So we would like to see it up to 125 percent of SMI and then the states being able to set the guideline wherever is appropriate for that state because there is so much variation.

Mr. KILDEE. Anyone else have any comments on that? Does anyone have any comments or any summary, or some questions I have not asked? Your testimony has been excellent, you written testimony also and your summary presented here today.

My intent is to proceed with reauthorization at meaningful levels here. Again, we're going to have to compete, both in the budget process and in the appropriations process, but I think that the authorization bill should at least set what we think is the need. There is a need out there and the authorization should reflect realistically the need that exists for these types of programs.

If we don't do that, then we aren't giving good leads to either the Budget Committee or the Appropriations Committee as to where the funding levels should be.

So, our expertise here is to look at the need and try to translate that need into the authorization bill, push hard, of course, for full authorization. But if you don't raise the authorization level up, of course, you are guaranteed not to get any increases in appropriations because the appropriations cannot exceed authorizations.

I'd like to stay in contact with all of you in some fashion as we proceed. Mr. Tauke and I work very closely together on this bill and he shares my deep concern for children. So let's try to remain in contact one with another on this.

If anyone has any summary comments, just feel free. This is a very flexible forum here.

Yes, Ms. Burkhart.

Ms. BURKHART. I would just like to thank you again for the opportunity and to tell you that I welcome the opportunity for you to contact me again, not just relative to school-age child care, but to the whole issue of child care because I'm very much involved in a small local way, but I think it impacts in a national way.

So, please do feel free to contact if you ever need anything—Washington County.

Mr. KILDEE. One compliment I get very often, both myself and my staff, is that we have very good hearings and that the hearings are very meaningful and we learn a lot. The reason we have very good hearings—and I think we do—is we have very good witnesses.

We try to get people out there who have both the knowledge and the commitment to the program.

This has been very helpful to me today. It's not only increased my knowledge but increased my commitment to these programs. You can be assured that as we march through this authorization process I will keep in mind everything you've told us here today and I will keep it in mind also as I go across two buildings over for my budget meetings as we set our priorities over there.

Thank you very much. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:06 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]